

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the Application.

Claims 1-3 and 9-16 stand rejected.

Claims 4-8 have been canceled.

New claims 17-21 have been added.

As Applicant informed the Examiner over the telephone, Applicants will respond to the rejections below by asserting that certain limitations within the claims are not taught or suggested by the cited prior art, and the obviousness rejection fails because it is not supported by any objective evidence.

I. OBJECTED TO DRAWINGS

On the Office Action Summary sheet, it is stated that the drawings are objected to by the Examiner. However, the Examiner provides no further description of such an objection in the body of the Office Action.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 12-14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Singh* (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,447). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As the Examiner is well aware, for a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of the claim must be found within the cited prior art reference. With respect to claims 1, 9 and 13, *Singh* does not teach or suggest removing a completed activity from the ordered list when that activity completes. Instead, *Singh* merely discloses that when an application is not used within a predetermined amount of time, it may be closed. In such a case, such an activity will be removed from the list. Removing an activity when it is not

being used within a certain amount of time is not the same as that activity completing. *Singh* by its own teachings discloses that these activities have not completed and are still active.

New claims 17-19 and 21 further recite that only the activity at the top of the list is displayed. *Singh* clearly does not disclose this limitation, since it actually displays a plurality of applications currently operating on the system, as shown in Figures 2, 4 and 7.

New claim 20 further recites that completion of an activity is performed automatically, where it is then removed from the ordered list.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Singh* in view of *Hughes et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,109,484). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The Examiner admits that *Singh* fails to teach that the activities are configurations of devices attached to the data processing system. The Examiner attempts to overcome this deficiency by adding *Hughes* to *Singh*. The Examiner asserts that *Hughes* teaches activities for configuring devices attached to a data processing system with the use of a configuration list. Though *Hughes* pertains to the configuration of devices in a system, there is no suggestion within either of these prior art references to combine them to arrive at the claimed invention. *Singh* pertains to multiple software applications running in a system. One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would not have looked to combine *Hughes* with *Singh* to arrive at a process whereby the configurations performed within *Hughes* are listed and then as the configurations are completed they are removed from the list. Furthermore, one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would not have combined these

two references in order to arrive at a process whereby a new configuration is placed at the top of the list to be displayed. The Examiner's only motivation to combine these references is his own opinion that the devices in *Singh* would be configured because configuring devices is a necessary procedure before devices are to be used. First, this is the Examiner's own subjective opinion, and is not objective evidence, which is required to support an obviousness combination. Second, as noted above, the list of applications in *Singh* do not pertain to the configuration of these applications. There is no teaching or suggestion within *Singh* that any devices need to be configured, and thus in need of combining with the invention in *Hughes*. *Hughes* further provides no motivation to be combined with *Singh* so that configurations are removed from a displayed list once completed, or moved to the top of a list for display if it is still active.

IV. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining Claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an early allowance of such Claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.

AT9-99-357

PATENT

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 
Kelly K. Kordzik
Reg. No. 36,571

5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75270-2199
(512) 370-2851